

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 319

July 21, 1995, 11:11 a.m.
Page S-10461 Temp. Record

SUPPLEMENTAL-RESCISSIONS CONFERENCE/LIHEAP

SUBJECT: Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act . . . H.R. 1944. Hatfield motion to table Division I of the Wellstone/Moseley-Braun amendment No. 1833.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 57-40

SYNOPSIS: As introduced, H.R. 1944, the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act, will enact with minor modifications the provisions of H.R. 1158 (H.R. 1158 was an earlier supplemental rescissions bill (see vote No. 203), which President Clinton vetoed). After negotiations, the President agreed that he would not veto a bill containing the modifications in H.R. 1944.

Division I of the Wellstone/Moseley-Braun amendment would eliminate the \$319 million rescission in the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP) program and would offset that elimination by rescinding the same amount from Department of Defense administration and travel accounts.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Hatfield moved to table division I. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed division I of the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored division I of the amendment.

NOTE: Under Senate Rule XV, any amendment containing more than one proposition will be divided at a Senator's request. The request to divide the Wellstone/Moseley-Braun amendment was made per the terms of a prior unanimous consent request. Division II of the Wellstone/Moseley Braun amendment (see vote No. 320) would restore \$332.3 million in rescissions in education and job training programs and would offset that restoration by rescinding the same amount from Department of Defense administration and travel accounts.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The Wellstone/Moseley-Braun amendment has been offered because its proponents are upset with proposed rescissions in certain welfare programs. Division I of their amendment deals with LIHEAP, which is a program to pay for the heating and air conditioning

(See other side)

YEAS (57)			NAYS (40)			NOT VOTING (3)	
Republicans (47 or 90%)		Democrats (10 or 22%)	Republicans (5 or 10%)		Democrats (35 or 78%)	Republicans (2)	Democrats (1)
Bennett	Jeffords	Breaux	Abraham	Akaka	Kennedy	Ashcroft- ²	Inouye- ²
Bond	Kassebaum	Byrd	Campbell	Baucus	Kerry	Faircloth- ²	
Brown	Kempthorne	Daschle	Cohen	Biden	Kohl		
Burns	Kyl	Exon	Grassley	Bingaman	Lautenberg		
Chafee	Lott	Graham	Snowe	Boxer	Leahy		
Coats	Lugar	Heflin		Bradley	Levin		
Cochran	Mack	Johnston		Bryan	Lieberman		
Coverdell	McCain	Kerrey		Bumpers	Mikulski		
Craig	McConnell	Nunn		Conrad	Moseley-Braun		
D'Amato	Murkowski	Reid		Dodd	Moynihan		
DeWine	Nickles			Dorgan	Murray		
Dole	Packwood			Feingold	Pell		
Domenici	Pressler			Feinstein	Pryor		
Frist	Roth			Ford	Robb		
Gorton	Santorum			Glenn	Rockefeller		
Gramm	Shelby			Harkin	Sarbanes		
Grams	Simpson			Hollings	Simon		
Gregg	Smith				Wellstone		
Hatch	Specter						
Hatfield	Stevens						
Helms	Thomas						
Hutchison	Thompson						
Inhofe	Thurmond						
	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

bills of poor people. Division II deals with education and job training programs which primarily serve the disadvantaged. We will not comment on the merits of their amendment. All that matters is that procedurally it will kill this bill. The sole question Senators need to ask themselves is whether they think the United States will be better or worse off if this bill is not enacted.

The reason this bill will not pass if either of these division votes carries is that there is not enough time left in this year to consider changes to a rescission bill. Every Senator is aware that this issue has been contentious since the debate first began in March. At that time, there were still 6 months left in fiscal year 1995, the year in which the rescissions would be made. In June, after battles royale in Congress and several hard-fought compromises, President Clinton decided to veto the bill due to his objections (which he did not raise until the conference on the bill had been completed) to certain proposed rescissions. However, he then joined with Members of Congress to negotiate on his differences. At the end of June a deal was reached with the President to restore some of those rescissions. By this time, the budget process for the next fiscal year was well underway. The House quickly approved the new compromise on June 29, but the measure stalled in the Senate on June 30 (one day after the Senate passed the Budget Resolution conference report locking in deficit reduction numbers for fiscal year 1996) because Senators Wellstone and Moseley-Braun insisted that they be allowed to offer amendments without a time agreement. The Senate quite literally does not have time to continue debating this bill. Senator Dole therefore returned it to the calendar. Now, more than two weeks later, Senators Wellstone and Moseley-Braun have finally agreed to a time limit on a single amendment, which will be divided into two votes. Therefore, the Senate can quickly dispose of this measure. If Senators accept either division, though, the bill will be dead. We do not have time to renegotiate with the House and the President. A "yea" vote on either is a vote to kill this bill.

The six months of squabbling over its terms have already delayed the billions of dollars in needed disaster assistance it contains. All Senators can agree on the need for this assistance. Additionally, all Senators should now agree that we should make certain we pass the proposed rescissions as well. At the start of this debate, Congress had not agreed to cut spending for the next fiscal year. However, those spending cuts are now locked in. This difference is significant because of the way in which budget authority (BA) and outlays interact from year to year. BA for one year often does not result in outlays until future years. LIHEAP is an extreme case in point because it is advance-funded--all of its BA appropriations are for outlays in the next fiscal year. The appropriations committees have had their outlay spending caps lowered already for fiscal year 1996. Because most programs' budget authority is not entirely spent in the year in which it is appropriated, budget authority will have to be reduced by even more to meet the new outlay caps. For example, nearly all of the LIHEAP rescissions in this bill are for FY 1996 outlays. If we do not make this rescission, those outlays will have to be made. Appropriators will therefore have to reduce other budget authority by enough to make up for those LIHEAP outlays. If they were to cut educational funding, they would have to cut approximately \$2.5 billion in BA in order to achieve the required outlay savings, because that program only spends 12 percent of its BA in the year in which it is appropriated. The same numbers hold true for most of the other programs in the non-defense discretionary side of the budget, which is where all the cuts would be made to pay for the failure to pass this rescission bill. The net result of failing to pass this bill making \$16 billion in cuts now is that much larger cuts will have to be made within the next couple of weeks, and those cuts will be in the very social programs our colleagues are trying to save with this amendment. Time is up--if these divisions of the Wellstone/Moseley-Braun amendment are not tabled, this bill is dead.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The rescissions in this bill are grossly unfair to poor people. More than 60 percent of the cuts will be in programs to serve the poor. We are especially troubled by the proposed cuts in LIHEAP and in education and job training. For LIHEAP, we note for Senators that voting to restore funding will be consistent with the Senate's original position. The President and the House both pushed for a huge rescission of funds, but the Senate voted against rescinding any. The conference report on the bill vetoed by the President made a 25 percent reduction. When the President negotiated this compromise bill, he failed to push for the restoration of these funds. We believe he made a mistake. We have seen a convincing study that shows that without LIHEAP funding many poorer Americans are forced between eating or paying their heating bills. No one should have to make such a horrible choice. The need for cooling assistance is also great, as has been demonstrated by the heat wave which is even now sweeping the country and claiming the lives of hundreds of poor people. These recent deaths show that more, not less, Federal money is needed to pay the air-conditioning bills of the poor. We also think that Senators should vote for the Wellstone/Moseley-Braun proposal to delete some of the proposed rescissions in education and job-training programs. These proposals would actually add back more funding than was originally passed in the Senate bill. We never favored these rescissions in the first place, and at this point we think we are in a position to demand that they not be made. Republicans want to pass this bill. Senators should not be led into believing that passing either division will kill this bill--we think the Republicans are bluffing. If the Wellstone/Moseley-Braun amendment is accepted, the House will quickly relent, and the President will sign the bill. Thus, these votes are not to kill the bill--they are to restore needed social funding. We support that funding, particularly for LIHEAP, and thus oppose the motion to table.